

REMARKS

By the response, claims 27, 28, 30-33, 35-38, 54, 56-65 and 67 are pending in the present application. Claims 27, 35, 56, and 62 are amended and are the independent claims. Claims 1-26, 29, 39, 41-53, 55 and 66 were previously cancelled. Claims 34 and 40 are cancelled herein.

STATEMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b)

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy shown during the telephonic interview conducted on January 26, 2010. During the interview the Applicant and the Examiner discussed the independent claims, claims 26, 35, 56 and 62 as well as the cited references U.S. Patent No. 6,289,102 to Ueda and U.S. Patent No. 5,737,286 to Timmermans.

The Examiner suggested amending the independent claims to overcome the current prior art rejections. For example, the Examiner suggested adding the limitations of dependent claim 34 into the independent claims. While dependent claim 34 is currently rejected, for the reasons discussed during the interview the Examiner stated that adding dependent claim 34 to the independent claims may distinguish the independent claims over the cited references.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 27, 28, 30-38, 40, 54, 56-65 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,289,102 to Ueda et al. ("Ueda") and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,737,286 to Timmermans et al. ("Timmermans"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Applicant believes the pending claims are patentable over Ueda and Timmermans at least for the reasons set forth in the response filed October 2, 2009. However, to forward prosecution the Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner for placing them in condition for allowance by inserting the limitations of former dependent claim 34 into the independent claims.

Consideration and entry of this Amendment at this point in prosecution where a final rejection has been mailed is proper because the language added to the independent claims has already been searched and considered by the Examiner as it was formerly found in independent claims 34 and 40.

In view of the amendments made herein, dependent claims 34 and 40 have been cancelled without prejudice for being redundant.

The Applicant believes that the pending claims are patentable over the cited references for the reasons discussed during the interview conducted on January 26, 2010. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of claims 27, 28, 30-33, 35-38, 54, 56-65 and 67 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending objections and rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$130.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Terry L. Clark, Reg. No. 32,644
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

TLC/PXL:has